



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/650,834	05/20/96	WREN	S WR-6

NORMAN L. WILSON JR.
P O BOX 270448
ST LOUIS MO 63126

TM02/0212

EXAMINER

KALINOWSKI, A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2166

DATE MAILED:

02/12/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

**Notification of Non-Compliance with
37 CFR 1.192(c)**

Application No.
08/650,834

Applicant(s)

Stephen C. Wren

Examiner
Alexander Kalinowski

Group Art Unit
2166



The Appeal Brief filed on Nov 2, 2000 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c). See MPEP § 1206.

Applicant is given a TIME LIMIT of ONE MONTH from the date of this letter or any time remaining in the period under 37 CFR 1.192(a) for filing a new complete brief. If a new brief that fully complies with 37 CFR 1.192(c) is not timely submitted, the appeal will be dismissed. The new complete brief must be filed IN TRIPLICATE. See 37 CFR 1.192(a).

1. ☐ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☒ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, pending or cancelled, or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)).
4. ☐ The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)).
5. ☐ The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).
6. ☒ A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and
 - a. ☐ the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
 - b. ☒ the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
7. ☐ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).
8. ☒ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).
9. ☒ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):
see attached

Art Unit: 2166

1. The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto. The copy of the appealed claims attached to the appeal brief differ from the claims of record in application Ser. No. 08/650,834. Specifically, claim 20 in the attached copy of the claims to the appeal brief differs from claim 20 on appeal. Claim 20, lines 3-4 in the copy of appealed claims attached to the appeal brief differs from claim 20, lines 3-4 on appeal. The claim language of claim 20 attached to the appeal brief recites "... computerized central communications facilities, the central communications facility having information related to goods and services stored in a database, the improvement ...". The claim language differs from claim 20 in application Ser. No. 08/650,834 which recites "... computerized central communications facilities central communications with information relating to goods and services stored in a database, the improvement ...".

2. The brief failed to explain the difference between the groups of claims identified in the Appeals Brief (see Paper No. 18, page 6). The appellant identified claims 20-23 and claims 24-29, in the section titled grouping of claims. Appellant grouped claims 20-23. Appellant further indicated that claims 24-29 were separately patentable from claims 20-23. However, Appellant did not explain why claims 24-29 were separately patentable from claims 20-23. The appellant is required to explain why the claims of the group or groups are believed to be separately patentable in the arguments section (see MPEP Section 1208 and 37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).

3. The brief failed to properly disclose the status of the claims, whether canceled, pending or on appeal (see MPEP Section 1206 and 37 CFR 1.192(c)(3). Although the appellant mentioned

Art Unit: 2166

claims 10-19 in the section titled status of the claims, the appellant did not indicate the status of claims 10-19. Furthermore, Appellant failed to discuss claims 1-9.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Kalinowski, whose telephone number is (703) 305-2398. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM. In addition, the examiner can be reached on alternate Fridays.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz, can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax telephone number for this group is (703) 305-0040.

Alexander Kalinowski

2/6/2001

AK


TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100